

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the comments set forth fully below. Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20-25, 27-36, 38-45, 47 and 48 were pending. Within the Office Action, Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20-25, 27-36, 38-45, 47 and 48 have been rejected. Accordingly, Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20-25, 27-36, 38-45, 47 and 48 are now pending.

Within the Office Action, prior art reference “Tock” is cited by name only. Applicant, in this response, assumes the Examiner is referring to U.S. Patent No. 7,085,817 to Tock et al., which is cited by the Examiner in the included Notice of References Cited.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Within the Office Action, Claims 2-6, 10-17, 20, 22-25, 27-33, 35, 36, 38-42, 44, 45, 47 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,163,779 to Mantha et al. (hereinafter “Mantha”) in view of U.S. Application No. 2002/0116444 to Chaudhri et al. (hereinafter “Chaudhri”), U.S. Patent No. 6,804,783 to Wesinger, Jr. et al. (“Wesinger”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,085,817 to Tock et al. (hereinafter “Tock”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Each of the independent Claims 2, 22, 35, 44 and 48 recites, in one form or another, claim limitation “wrapping, by the server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system” and claim limitation “delivering an original version of said first electronic content to said client device if said link is not wrapped in step (e), wherein said original version of said first electronic content is unmodified,” wherein each is discussed below.

*Claim limitation: “wrapping, by the server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system”*

It is recognized on page 4 of the Office Action that “Mantha and Chaudhri do not expressly disclose both an external and internal DNS, and determining to wrap based on resolvability.” Wesinger is apparently cited for this reason.

It is respectfully noted that Applicant has made the following arguments regarding Wesinger in the response dated April 3, 2009, yet the Examiner failed to answer the substance of these arguments as required by MPEP 707.07(f). Instead, the Examiner merely continues to repeat the same rejection provided in the Office Action dated January 5, 2009, failing to provide any explanation as to why the Applicant's reasoning is incorrect. According to MPEP 707.07(f), when the applicant traverses a rejection, the examiner must, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it. Since Examiner has failed to answer the substance of the previously submitted arguments provided in Applicant's response dated April 3, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner provide an explanation as to why Applicant's arguments are insufficient.

In the response dated April 3, 2009, Applicant argued that Wesinger simply teaches a firewall that provides enhance network security by employing "envoys." No traffic can pass through the firewall unless the firewall has established an envoy for that traffic. [Wesinger, Abstract] The firewall is associated with a respective domain name server. [Wesinger, col. 8, lines 9-10] DNS is a distributed database system that translates host names to IP addresses and IP addresses to host names. [Wesinger, col. 7, lines 46-49] The primary function of a firewall is to selectively allow and disallow communication. [Wesinger, col. 9 lines 9-10] However, Wesinger does not teach a mechanism for retrieving electronic content that is associated with a local network. Even if allowing and disallowing communication can be construed as retrieving electronic content, Wesinger does not teach wrapping links within the electronic content such that the links are fully-qualified URLs. Translating host names to IP addresses and vice versa is different from wrapping links such the links are fully-qualified URLs.

Tock teaches techniques for modifying requests or browser viewable documents to access resources residing on remote servers through an intermediate server is facilitated. [Tock, Abstract] Although Tock teaches a response that is modified so that internal links point to the intermediary server instead of the remote servers, nowhere in Tock does Tock disclose both an external and internal DNS, and determining to wrap based on resolvability.

Accordingly, neither Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock nor their combination teach wrapping, by the server, said link to obtain a wrapped version of said link that identifies a resolvable address on the network in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the domain name system internal to said network, and not wrapping said link in the event it is determined in said step (d) that said link is resolvable by the external Internet domain name system.

*Claim limitation: "delivering an original version of said first electronic content to said client device if said link is not wrapped in step (e), wherein said original version of said first electronic content is unmodified"*

It is recognized on page 4 of the Office Action that "Mantha, Chaudhri and Wesinger do not expressly disclose delivering an original, unmodified version of the content." Tock is apparently cited for this reason. Applicant's attention is directed to col. 7, line 27 - col. 9, line 50. It is the Examiner's interpretation that this section teaches the claimed limitation of delivering an original, unmodified version of content by the server associated with the network to the client device outside of the network if said link is not wrapped. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation.

Since Tock does not teach an external and internal DNS, Tock does not teach a client device outside of the network. It therefore follows that Tock does not teach delivering an original, unmodified version of the content to the client device residing outside of the network.

The cited section of Tock teaches that a user begins by interacting with a client machine to request a login page, which permits the user to log onto the intermediary server for authorization purposes. [Tock, col. 7, lines 56-61] After a successful login, an initial webpage from the intermediary server is displayed, wherein the initial webpage has at least some of the hyperlinks embedded therein are initially directed to the intermediary server instead of a remote server that hosts the content associated with the hyperlink. [Tock, col. 8, lines 22-28] If a hyperlink on the webpage has been selected, a host name lookup is performed to obtain the IP address associated with the selected hyperlink, and a connection is opened/maintained between the client machine and the intermediary server. [Tock, col. 8, lines 37-44] When the intermediary server receives a response to the request, the response is modified so that internal links point to the intermediary server instead of one or more remote servers. The modified response or the unmodified response is saved to the central storage to create a historical database of accessed resources for the requestor and thus enabling subsequent retrieval of previously viewed resources. The modified response is sent to the requestor. [Tock, col. 7, lines 28-38] The cited section of Tock does not teach delivering an original, unmodified version of the content by the server associated with the network to the client device outside of the network.

Accordingly, neither Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock nor their combination teach delivering an original version of said first electronic content to said client device if said link is not wrapped in step (e), wherein said original version of said first electronic content is unmodified.

*Claims 2-6, 10-17 and 20*

Since independent Claim 2 recites at least these claim limitations not found Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination, Claim 2 is therefore nonobvious and patentable over Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination. For at least these reasons, Claim 2 is in condition of allowance.

Claims 3-6, 10-17 and 20 are dependent upon the independent Claim 2. As discussed above, independent Claim 2 is an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Claims 3-6, 10-17 and 20 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination do not teach dependent Claim 5 which includes the limitation: said link includes an external address portion identifying said network device and an internal address portion identifying a second electronic content within said network. Within the Office Action, Mantha, Figure 15 is cited as teaching this limitation. Specifically, within the Office Action, “www.artscape.com” is cited as the external address portion and “/ceramics.html” is cited as the internal address portion. However, this is clearly improper. The cited URL in Mantha is merely a standard URL with “www.artscape.com” as the host name and “/ceramics.html” as the path or specific resource within the host to be accessed. In contrast, the present invention includes an external address portion (208) that corresponds to an address that is resolvable outside the local network including a numerical IP address that was assigned by the local DNS and thus is not resolvable outside the local network. The link also contains an address portion (212) that includes an unqualified symbolic name that is an internal name within the local network and thus not resolvable outside the local network. [Present Specification, page 11, lines 6-15] For at least these additional reasons, Claim 5 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination.

*Claims 22-25 and 27-33*

Since independent Claim 22 recites at least these claim limitations not found Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination, Claim 22 is therefore nonobvious and patentable over Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination. For at least these reasons, Claim 22 is in condition of allowance.

Claims 23-25 and 27-33 are dependent upon the independent Claim 22. As discussed above, independent Claim 22 is an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Claims 23-25 and 27-33 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, for the same reasons provided for dependent Claim 5, Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination do not teach dependent Claim 24. For at least these additional reasons, Claim 24 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination.

*Claims 35, 36 and 38-42*

Since independent Claim 35 recites at least these claim limitations not found Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination, Claim 35 is therefore nonobvious and patentable over Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination. For at least these reasons, Claim 35 is in condition of allowance.

Claims 36 and 38-42 are dependent upon the independent Claim 35. As discussed above, the independent Claim 35 is an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Claims 36 and 38-42 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, for the same reasons provided for dependent Claim 5, Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination do not teach dependent Claim 36. For at least these additional reasons, Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination.

*Claims 44, 45 and 47*

Since independent Claim 44 recites at least these claim limitations not found Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination, Claim 44 is therefore nonobvious and patentable over Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination. For at least these reasons, Claim 44 is in condition of allowance.

Claims 45 and 47 are dependent upon the independent Claim 44. As discussed above, the independent claim 44 is an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Claims 45 and 47 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

*Claim 48*

Since independent Claim 48 recites at least these claim limitations not found Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination, Claim 48 is therefore nonobvious and patentable over Mantha, Chaudhri, Wesinger, Tock and their combination. For at least these reasons, Claim 48 is in condition of allowance.

*Claims 21, 34 and 43*

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 21, 34 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha, Chaudhri, and Wesinger, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,065 to Rodkin et al. (hereinafter “Rodkin”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 21 is dependent on the independent Claim 2; Claim 34 is dependent on the independent Claim 22 and Claim 43 is dependent on the independent Claim 35. As described above, independent Claims 2, 22 and 35 are all allowable base claims. Accordingly, Claims 21, 34 and 43 are allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,  
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: September 30, 2009

By: /Thomas B. Haverstock/  
Thomas B. Haverstock  
Reg. No. 32,571  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)